

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 25, 2005 in which Claims 30-33 and 36 were withdrawn from consideration and in which Claims 1-29, 34, 35 and 37-52 were rejected. With this response, Claims 25 and 30-33 are cancelled; Claims 1, 8, 12, 17, 24, 28, 34, 41, and 42 are amended; and Claims 53-56 are added. Claims 1-24, 26-29 and 34-56 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On February 24th, 2006, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Bui and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of independent claims one, 34, 41 and 42 was discussed. It was tentatively agreed upon and that such claims, as amended, overcome the rejections based upon the prior art of record.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Bui for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for Examiner Bui's suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the prior art of record.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-13, 16-25, 41-42, 44-45 and 47 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Based Upon Lee.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-9, 12-13, 16-25, 41-42, 44-45 and 47 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. US 6,606,256. Claim 25 is canceled. Claims, 1-9, 12-13, 16-24, 41-42, 44-45 and 47 as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Lee.

A. Claims 1, and 42.

Claims 1, 41 and 42, as amended, recite a module which includes either a handle (Claims one and 42) or second means coupled to the first means for being manually moved between a first position in which the second means retains a module within the chassis when the inserted into the chassis and a second position permitting withdrawal of the module from the chassis (Claim 41), wherein the handle

or the second means extend on a single transverse side of an enclosure of the module or the first means when the handle or the second means is in the retracted position. As agreed upon during the Examiner interview held on February 26, 2006, neither Lee nor the prior art of record disclose a module having a handle that extends on a transverse side of an enclosure when in the retracted position. Accordingly, Claims 1, 41 and 42, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Lee. Claims 2-9, 12-13, and 16-24 and Claims 44-45 and 47 depend from Claims 1 and 42, respectively, and overcome the rejection for the same reasons

III. Rejection of Claims 10-11, 14-15 and 28-29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon the Lee and Bovell.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 10-11, 14-15 and 28-29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Bovell US publication 2003/0161118. Claims 1-4, 7, 11 and 15, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Lee and Bovell.

A. Claims 10-11, 14-15 and 29.

Claims 10-11, 14-15 and 29 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection based upon Lee and Bovell the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Bovell fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Lee. B.

Claim 29, as amended, recites that the enclosure includes at least one air flow opening extending along a first plane and wherein the handle extends substantially within a second plane perpendicular to the first plane on one side of the at least one air flow opening.

Neither Lee nor Bovell disclose a handle that extends in a plane perpendicular to an air flow opening on one side of an air flow opening. Accordingly, Claim 29, as amended, overcomes the rejection for this additional reason

IV. Rejection of Claims 17-22, 34-35, 37-40 and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Lee and Pham.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action rejected Claims 17-22, 34-35, 37-40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Pham et al US 4,885,436. Claims 17-22, 34-35, 37-40 and 43, as amended, overcome the rejection.

A. Claims 17-22 and 43

Claims 17-22 and 43 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection of the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Pham fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Lee.

B. Claim 34

Claim 34, as amended, recites a computing device module having an enclosure with a recess extending on entirely one side of the enclosure. The module further includes a handle having an arm portion that is received within the recess when in a retracted position.

As tentatively agreed upon during the Examiner interview held on February 20 4, 2006, neither Lee nor Pham, alone or in combination, disclose a computing device module having a recess extending on entirely one side of an enclosure, wherein the recess receives an arm portion of a handle. Thus, claim 34, as amended, overcomes the rejection. Claims 35 and 37-40 depend from Claim 34 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

V. Rejection of Claims 23, 26-27 and 46 Under U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Lee

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action rejected Claims 23, 26-27 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. US 6,606,256. Claims 23 and 26-27 and Claim 46 depend from Claim 1 and Claim 42, respectively, and overcome the rejection of same reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 46.

VI. Rejection of Claims 24 and 48-52 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Lee and Reiter.

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action rejected Claims 24 and 48-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Reiter et al, US 5,557,499. Claims 24 and 48-52, as amended, overcome the rejection based on Lee and Reiter.

A. Claims 24 and 48

Claims 24 and 48 depend from Claims 1 and 42, respectively, for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 42. Reiter fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Lee.

B. Claims 49-52

Claim 49 recites a method for positioning a module relative to a chassis of a computing device. The method includes inserting a module into the chassis, pitting a handle coupled to the chassis from a releasing position to retain positioned and screwing the handle to at least one of the chassis and an enclosure of the module to retain a handle in the retracted position.

Neither Lee nor Reiter, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a method wherein a handle is pivoted relative to the chassis to a retracted position and screwed to one of the chassis and an enclosure to retain the handle in a retracted position. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 49-52 be withdrawn.

VII. Added Claims.

With this response, Claims 53-56 are added. Claims 53-56 are patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A. Claim 53

Claim 53 depends from Claim 1 and recites an enclosure which includes at least one air flow opening, wherein the handle extends on one transverse side of the air flow opening when in the retracted position. The prior art of record fails to

disclose a handle which extends on a single transverse side of an air flow opening when the handle is in a retracted position. Claim 54 depends from Claim 53.

Accordingly, added Claims 53 and 54 are presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claim 55

Claim 55 depends from Claim 1 and recites at least one light emitting display extending along a face of the module, wherein the handle extends on a single transverse side of the at least one light emitting display. The prior art of record fails to disclose a handle that extends along a side of a light emitting display when in a retracted position. Thus, added Claim 55 is presented for consideration and allowance.

C. Claim 56

Claim 56 depends from Claim 1 and recites that the enclosure includes a recess on a transverse side of the at least one air flow opening, wherein the recess is configured to receive a portion of the handle when the handle is in the retracted position. The prior art of record fails to disclose an enclosure having a recess on a side of an air flow opening, wherein the recess receives a portion of a handle when the handle is in a retracted position. Thus, Claim 56 is presented for consideration and allowance.

IX. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-24, 26-29, and 34-56 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Feb. 27, 2006

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
9106 W. Stanford Court
Mequon, WI 53097
Telephone: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276